

E 3528

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — *Extensions of Remarks*

April 30, 1969

ordinating work involving the use of the organization and facilities of *The New York Times* on behalf of the CIA and the "New Team."

Other persons who had a role included William H. Brubeck who had been the recipient of the 1960 "leak" of Top Secret information from the State Department to the campaign headquarters of John Kennedy which contributed significantly to Mr. Kennedy's narrow victory at the election polls. After Mr. Kennedy's victory, Mr. Brubeck received complete information about Mr. Otepka's role in tracing this "leak", the former Ambassador revealed.

Other members of the "New Team" were McGeorge Bundy and his brother William Bundy, who had moved from the Central Intelligence Agency to become the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, including Vietnam.

"THE NEW TEAM"

The "New Team" at the Central Intelligence Agency was being planned by Attorney General Robert Kennedy even before the Bay of Pigs "fiasco" in 1961. In fact, the former Ambassador said, the Attorney General had a special group of his own "monitoring" the Bay of Pigs operation to determine which persons, not yet projected for the "New Team", would "pass the test".

Although the "Bay of Pigs" was a national disaster, the source said, Robert Kennedy exploited it within the Government to accelerate building the "New Team."

NEW TEAM GOALS

The "New Team" goals were set by the "personality" of Robert Kennedy and the "philosophy" of President John Kennedy and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the source revealed. The main exponent of this "philosophy" was Major General Maxwell Taylor, assisted by McGeorge Bundy and Walt Whitman Rostow, the former Ambassador said.

The mission of the "New Team" was to contest the Soviet penetration of the "Third World," the so-called nonaligned countries through "paramilitary, parapolitical and paradiplomatic" means. To do this, the "New Team" was to be a "paragovernment", performing for the United States "the same kind of functions" which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union performed for the Soviet Union, the former Ambassador revealed.

This required the "New Team" to penetrate every department and agency of the Executive Branch dealing with foreign policy by inserting "trusted members" of the "New Team" into key positions. Among these were the Office of Security of the State Department, the military services departments, the United States Information Agency and the Agency for International Development, the source added.

"NEW TEAM" MEMBERS

Besides Robert Kennedy and Maxwell Taylor, other members of the "New Team" were General Marshall S. Carter, who replaced General Charles B. Cabell as Deputy Director of the CIA. Very early "recruits" to the "New Team" were Richard Helms, today the Director of the CIA, and Cartha "Deke" DeLoach, the second man in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Together with Robert McNamara and Dean Rusk, the "New Team" acting under the control of Robert Kennedy began the "infiltration" of the State Department and the Defense Departments with Central Intelligence Agency personnel. "Counterinsurgency" projects sprung up in every agency dealing with foreign affairs.

OUTSIDE "INSIDERS"

Besides key persons officially already in the Government, the "New Team" selected persons in leading banks, law firms and foundations for the penetration of the "non-governmental" apparatus of the United States,

the former Ambassador revealed. Because of the paramount role of *The New York Times* in American life and because of the "black" assignments which it might be asked to perform for the CIA, great care was taken to select a person who had full access to every office in *The New York Times* and yet could conceal his own operations. This was especially important because "gray" operations, involving special background briefings for such top *New York Times* representatives as James Reston and Tom Wicker were already going on, and top *New York Times* reporters were in an especially good position to "uncover" the "black" operations.

BANCROFT'S PAST

Harding Bancroft had been originally introduced into the State Department by Alger Hiss, and, after Mr. Hiss became the head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Mr. Bancroft served under Dean Rusk as a member of the Department's Office of Special Political Affairs, renamed the Office of United Nations Affairs. Subsequently, he took the post of General Counsel to the International Labor Organization in Geneva and then went to *The New York Times*, eventually to be named Executive Vice President.

During the Eisenhower administration, Harding Bancroft worked closely with Dean Rusk, President of the Rockefeller Foundation, maintaining close liaison with John Foster Dulles and with Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

BANCROFT'S COVER

Because Mr. Bancroft's liaison role at *The New York Times* required meeting with top CIA and State Department officials, especially on matters of "Personnel", it was decided to provide him with "cover" by designating him a "member" of the newly created State Department Advisory Committee on International Organization Affairs, whose task was to recommend the "best qualified Americans" for those international organization positions in which they could make important contributions.

Although the Advisory Committee eventually prepared a "Report", which was itself controversial in its original draft form, the basic role of the Committee was to provide a "cover" for the "New Team," the source revealed.

"ROADBLOCK" OTEPKA

One of the major "roadblocks" to the "infiltration" of the State Department by the Central Intelligence Agency New Team was Otto F. Otepka, its top Security Evaluators. Mr. Otepka had already "annoyed" the Central Intelligence Agency by his "uncovering" the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in using "double agents" in the Warsaw "sex and spy" scandals. Subsequently, Mr. Otepka "annoyed" Robert Kennedy and Dean Rusk by insisting, in December 1960, that Walt Whitman Rostow would need a "full field FBI investigation" before he could be "cleared" for employment in the State Department. Mr. Rostow had just completed in December a "secret" mission in Moscow for President-elect John Kennedy. The mission was "cleared" by CIA Director Allen Dulles. Previously, Mr. Rostow had established the CIA channels at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University professors maintained their own CIA "black" ties with Washington through the Institute, the former Ambassador asserted.

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Apr. 16, 1969]

AID MANIPULATED JOB RECORDS AND RATINGS

Following the revelations in this newspaper on February 21, 1968 about the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal" and the resignation of five officials of the Agency for International Development, this newspaper

received documentary evidence on April 11 of this year that three senior A.I.D. officials have since then been engaged in selectively manipulating the personnel records of foreign service employees of that Agency. The records involved affect the promotion and "selection out" of foreign service personnel.

As readers will recall, the revelations about the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal" were widely publicized a year ago by Senators and by Congressman. According to the accounts, a top A.I.D. official, having a "sexual affair" with a "seductive secretary" of the Belgian firm of J & M Andriænnessens, allowed the foreign company to overcharge the U.S. government by more than \$250,000 for repairs on excess property.

Subsequently, this top official and a top A.I.D. inspector became involved in "rivalry for the sexual lures of the secretary", the press reported. Trips were taken by the young lady, with other beauties, and the A.I.D. staff to Rome, Paris, Nice, where the "sweet life" of France and Italy was fully enjoyed. The case, uncovered in the end by Congressional staff investigators, finally involved the Belgian police and prosecutor's office.

The five A.I.D. officials who resigned because of the embarrassment of the scandal included Herbert J. Waters, who prior to his employment at A.I.D. had served as the Senatorial election campaign manager in 1954 and 1960 of Hubert H. Humphrey. Others who resigned included Paul H. Scordas, a career Army Colonel hired after retirement as a Foreign Service Reserve Officer, Class 2; and Jack K. Wall, who was the Director of the Excess Property program for A.I.D. in Europe. Mr. Wall was indicted on December 9, 1968 and is awaiting trial.

The three A.I.D. officers now revealed by documentary evidence as having carried out a selective alteration of the restricted files and folders of foreign service personnel are H. Rex Lee, formerly the Governor of American Samoa and currently a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, who was the Assistant Administrator for Administration of A.I.D. during the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal"; Edward F. Tenant, currently the Acting Assistant Administrator for Administration and Governor Lee's successor at A.I.D.; and Joseph S. Toner, who was the Director of Personnel Administration for A.I.D. when the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal" developed. Mr. Toner is still in the same job.

According to information received by this newspaper, one of the persons rated by Paul Scordas wrote to Governor Lee personally complaining about the rating he had received. The complaining employee, James A. Gibson, was on very good personal terms with persons associated with supporters of Hubert H. Humphrey, especially Herbert J. Waters, this newspaper was informed.

At the end of this article there is published the complete text of a memorandum, dated November 12, 1968, from Mr. Toner to Mr. Tenant concerning the disposition of the Performance Evaluation Report and the Development Appraisal Report written by Paul Scordas on James Gibson. Information available to this newspaper indicates that no other employee rated by Paul Scordas had his reports reviewed by Governor Lee.

In his memorandum of November 12 to Mr. Tenant, Mr. Toner refers to a letter of October 12, 1968 written by Governor Lee. Readers of *The Exchange* will be interested to note that the Congressional Record reveals that fully one month earlier, on September 13, Governor Lee had already been confirmed by the Senate for his new post as a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission. Governor Lee took the oath of his new office on October 24, 1968.

In addition to receiving documentary evidence of selective treatment given to certain A.I.D. persons with good connections, this newspaper was further informed that James

M. Kearns, a Schedule C political appointee and currently the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Administration, is being sharply criticized by A.I.D. personnel allegedly for permitting the re-writing and re-defining of job descriptions and titles to permit the "mass hiring" of retired military personnel who will be employed in the near future as "Foreign Service Reserve Officers", displacing the career civil service and career foreign service personnel entitled to first consideration under a Reduction in Force program.

According to the reports, Mr. Kearns is being assisted in this project by Lester T. David, a Colonel on active duty with the Air Force who is nominally a consultant with A.I.D. but is actually in charge of the Agency's Government Property Resources Office. Retired military personnel already promised positions by Colonel David and Mr. Kearns include former A.I.D. personnel recently dismissed in the Reduction in Force program because they did not have sufficient seniority. They would return to these positions as new employees following "re-organization" of the Government Property Resources Office, this newspaper was informed.

Included among those for whom positions will be created in the "re-organization" are persons who were returned from Frankfurt and Antwerp after being "relieved" of duty in connection with the "sex and kickback" scandals there.

There follows below the full verbatim text of the memorandum of November 12, from Mr. Toner to Mr. Tennant:

"NOVEMBER 12, 1968.

"To: AA/A, Mr. Edward F. Tennant.

"From: A/PM, Joseph S. Toner.

"Subject: Performance Evaluation.

"Report: James A. Gibson.

"Pursuant to instruction in Mr. Lee's memorandum of October 12, 1968, we are taking the following action:

"1. The Performance Evaluation Report prepared by Mr. Scordas will be removed from Mr. Gibson's restricted file and will be placed in a newly created folder which will not be for release under any circumstances.

"2. The memorandum from Mr. Lee to me dated October 12, 1968, will be placed in Mr. Gibson's restricted file as it spells out the circumstances surrounding the preparation of the Scordas Performance Evaluation Report.

"3. The Development Appraisal Report prepared by Mr. Scordas has been reviewed also and found to be equally damaging and thus has been removed from Mr. Gibson's restricted file.

"(cc: Mr. J. A. Gibson, Transportation Officer, Antwerp, Belg.; Mr. J. J. Jacobson, OIC, AID/EPRO-4 Frankfurt. Restricted file of Mr. J. A. Gibson.)"

UNWANTED BIRTHS AND POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, pity the poor unwanted child. Pity any unwanted child. Pity the unwanted poor child.

It is abundantly clear that the child born into poverty circumstances has several strikes against him at the outset. His chances for success in life are much lower than the chances for the middle-or upper-class child.

It is encouraging to see the tremendous interest shown in recent years in helping the underprivileged child and his family overcome these odds. The new

Federal programs confirm the desire of this Nation to give everyone an opportunity to raise himself from poverty situations.

In most deliberations of solutions to the poverty problem, very little attention has been given to family size and its relation to poverty. Dr. E. Sherman Adams, senior vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, has written an article on this subject for the Conference Board Record, in which he presents some statistics on poverty and family size. He dispels the impression that poor families are large because of choice. He refers to a study of married women in 1960 which showed that lower income families wanted smaller families than higher income couples.

Mr. Speaker, the article treats a subject which should be given greater attention in our efforts to solve the poverty problem. I commend it to my colleagues and include it at this point in the RECORD:

UNWANTED BIRTHS AND POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

(By E. Sherman Adams)

(Note.—Dr. Adams has had a varied career as an economist, educator, writer, lecturer, and banker. He is presently a senior vice president at First National City Bank, New York. The views expressed by the author are his own, and are based on his independent research.)

"A vicious circle of poverty and fertility is at work . . . Because they [the poor] do not limit the size of their families, the expense of raising unwanted children on inadequate incomes drives them deeper into poverty. The results are families without hope and children without future." (National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.)¹

Most Americans are not yet aware that unwanted births are a major factor perpetuating poverty in this country. Moreover, this is an evil which, if we decide to, we can cure—and at small cost.

Reports, speeches, books, articles and TV panels discuss at length other aspects of poverty—squallid housing, decayed neighborhoods, hunger and disease, unemployment, social barriers, and inferior schools. And many billions of dollars are expended annually on programs to alleviate these problems.

In sharp contrast, you rarely hear any reference to the high birth rate among the poor. Seldom does a writer or speaker mention that this intensifies and prolongs poverty in both urban and rural America. And the government spends the merest pittance on family planning services.

One recently published book includes 19 essays on various aspects of poverty in this country. You would search in vain to find a single reference to the birth rate or birth control. This is not unusual; it is typical.

Even the voluminous report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders contains only one brief paragraph on the subject. One of the three sentences in that paragraph does state that broader provision of family planning services could make "a significant contribution" to breaking the cycle of want and dependency, but the rest of this 174,000-word report deals with other matters.

IN THE UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES—AND HERE

Considerable attention has been given in recent years to the alarming implications of the population explosion in underdeveloped nations, and there is increasing recognition that rapid population growth breeds destitution, disease and ignorance in those countries. But few realize that the same process is at work in our own disadvantaged areas.

Footnotes at end of article.

Not long ago, an assemblage of distinguished intellectuals gathered at Arden House, New York, and spent four days discussing "The Population Dilemma" both in the U.S. and elsewhere. But the published report on this convocation hardly even hints that unwanted births among the needy are one of the basic causes of chronic poverty in this country.

Actually, the linkages between fertility and want in the United States are very much the same as in Latin American, Asian and African countries. They are more obvious in those nations primarily because a much larger proportion of the people are poor, their deprivation is greater, and large numbers of poverty-stricken children are much more in evidence than in this country.

In South American cities, for example, the visitor is always conscious of the surrounding barrios swarming with ragged waifs. But in the United States, poverty is less visible. Many of us rarely see the squalor of slum areas; we keep to the superhighways that bypass them. Most Americans have never visited any of the South's miserable Tobacco Roads.

And there are some who, in their concern about the underdeveloped countries, completely dismiss the problem in this country. An eminent Stanford professor of demography recently cited the overall population growth rate of about 1.2% in the U.S. and observed: "Surely our affluent society has the resources to cope with this level of growth."² The critical problem however, is not among the affluent, but among the poor. This is not a question of the overall growth rate for the nation as a whole; it is a problem of literally hundreds of thousands of unwanted babies born each year to poor families who become trapped in a subculture of despair.

Economists see plainly that in other parts of the world the disastrous famines predicted by Malthus may materialize, but they are confident that in this country, population will not outrun the food supply—at least not in the immediate future. The urgent problem here is admittedly not famine; it is the role of the high birth rate in perpetuating poverty. And this is something which is not discussed at all in economics textbooks.

AND THE POOR GET CHILDREN

There can be no doubt about the seriousness of this poverty-fertility circle. In the first place, there is ample data to document the saying that the rich get richer and the poor get children. Chicago's poor, for instance, have a birth rate on a par with India's. For the nation, the fertility rate—defined as the number of children born per 1,000 women in the 15-44 age group—is 55% greater among the poor than among the nonpoor. It inevitably follows that there is a much higher proportion of large families among the poor.

A recent Census Bureau report shows that 38% of all poor families with children, white and nonwhite, have four or more children, contrasted with only 17% of all nonpoor families. Indeed, among the poor, 24% have five or more children contrasted with only 7% of all nonpoor families.

And, of course, in a high percentage of needy families, the mother today is still of child-bearing age and will have more children. Many of the poverty-stricken families which presently have fewer than four children will eventually have four or five or six or more, unless they receive family planning assistance.

To put it somewhat differently, less than 10% of all families with only one or two children are poor, whereas 35% of all families with five or more children are poor. And again, the prospect today is that many of the poor families who now have only one or two children will eventually be in the five-or-more category.

April 30, 1969

According to Census Bureau statistics based on criteria established by the Social Security Administration, approximately 26 million persons in the United States today subsist in poverty. This figure is calculated on the basis of minimum nutritional standards and estimated minimum incomes required by various-sized families.

Some contend that this formula exaggerates the number of persons who really should be classed as being poor, and there would seem to be some validity in certain of these criticisms. On the other hand, one can hardly shrug off Census Bureau figures which show that the 26 million persons classified as poor have an average of only 70 cents per day for food for each member of the family. Moreover, there are almost a million more persons whose incomes would be below the poverty line if they were not receiving welfare.

In any event, the Census Bureau data are the best available, and even though the 26 million figure is debatable, percentage breakdowns based on these data are undoubtedly representative for very low-income families and individuals, however defined.

One such breakdown shows that of the 26 million poor persons in this country, 10½ million, or 41%, are children under 18, and most of these poor children are in large families. Of all children who are poor, 63% are in families which already have four or more children, and 45% are in families with five or more. And the plight of many of these children will become progressively worse as more unwanted babies arrive.

It is clear that a very high proportion of all poor persons are poor primarily because they were born to poverty. This obviously applies to virtually all of the 41% who are children. It also applies to millions of poor adults who were reared in poverty. Millions who are born poor are doomed to life-long poverty.

To be sure, some who are born to poverty are eventually able to improve their economic status. But many do not, and this is particularly true for those who grow up in large families. These account for a large percentage of the 15½ million adults who are poor. In their case, poverty and unwanted births have led to continuing poverty.

It is plain that if the birth rate were no higher among the poor than among the non-poor, there would be far fewer poor persons. For one thing, of course, this high natality is responsible for the fact that so many of these persons were born. But there is much more to it than that. Children in large poor families have far less chance of ever escaping from the cycle of want than those in smaller families.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Research shows conclusively that children in large poor families receive less attention from their parents, are less healthy, and are relatively less stable and confident than children in smaller families. In school, they show appreciably lower levels of mental development and therefore have less chance of ever raising themselves from poverty. A higher percentage of them become school dropouts, and some who do sit through high school receive, not diplomas, but "certificates" which are evidence that the recipients never attained eighth grade reading level.

In many instances, truancy and juvenile delinquency are side effects which further reduce the child's chances for economic betterment. All of these factors have psychological consequences which increase the odds that by the time the child reaches adulthood, he will be virtually beyond redemption.

A high percentage of these children will eventually join the ranks of the unemployed. Many will have no qualifications for holding a job. A substantial proportion will go on relief, which has become an inherited way of life in an increasing number of localities—a family tradition. Among their number will

be some alcoholics, dope addicts, and criminals.

Planned Parenthood Federation tells a case in point. A court in Brooklyn sent for the father of three juvenile delinquents in trouble with the law. The father told the policeman he could not come; he was too busy taking care of his eight other small children—and his wife was in the hospital giving birth to their 12th. The family was on relief.

Many unwanted children suffer from deep emotional problems. A prominent child psychiatrist writes that a deficiency in maternal care can lead to serious disturbances in mental health and development; unwanted children are subject to such a deficiency. He feels more planned parenthood is needed to prevent this emotional crippling. Unwanted births are, in this sense, a public health hazard of the over-population problem.

And as these children in large families grow up, the vicious cycle of fertility and poverty is repeated. Most of them marry young and immediately start having offspring at a rapid rate, thus insuring a large new generation of seriously disadvantaged children.

The more children poor families have, the poorer many of them become and the less chance they have of escaping from the bondage of poverty. One obvious reason is because each additional child means another mouth to feed and another body to clothe. Resources per child are reduced by every birth even if the family's income does not decline.

But in many cases, income actually declines. In 1966, 35% of all poor children were in households headed by women, the poorest of all the groups among the poor. The main source of income of most of these families is what the mother can earn and the more children she has, the less chance she has to work. Census data show that the average income of female-headed households is highest for those with only one child and that it declines sharply in direct proportion to the number of additional children.

A major reason why so many women and children are in this trap is desertion by the father, and a principal reason why many husbands abandon their families is because they have so many unwanted children. Census data indicate that poor female-headed households contain more children, on the average, than male-headed families. The Commission on Rural Poverty asserts:

"Unwanted pregnancies can, and often do, wreck any chance for a better life for either parents or children . . . The resulting stress and disorganization of family life are often too much for the father. In thousands of cases he gives up and deserts the family."¹

A report by a member of a team of doctors who conducted a study in the Delta counties of Mississippi states:

"The homes visited were usually occupied by mothers, worn and tired and looking much older than their actual ages. Their children would range in number from four to ten. Most often there was no father. Questioned as to his absence the responses would be 'we are separated' or, simply, 'I don't know where he is.'"²

FERTILITY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The high birth rate among the poor is also a major cause of their high rate of unemployment and underemployment. The great majority of disadvantaged youths cannot find employment except in unskilled jobs. Progress in industrial technology has been rapidly reducing the percentage of unskilled jobs in the U.S. economy. This is as true on the farm as in the city. In the span of only seven years, 1959–1966, unskilled jobs as a percentage of total civilian jobs declined from 30% to 23%. The lower rungs of the economic ladder are being lopped off.

Footnotes at end of article.

Meanwhile, because of the high birth rate among the poor, there has been a correspondingly rapid increase in the number of unskilled youths.

This imbalance between supply and demand in this part of the labor market is a basic reason for the high rate of subemployment among disadvantaged youths. In all probability, it has also tended to hold down wages in unskilled occupations.

This situation will become progressively worse over the years ahead, even under conditions of sustained general prosperity. In New York City, for instance, over half the ghetto unemployed were formerly employed, if at all, as laborers, but less than 1% of the new job openings expected to become available in the city between 1965 and 1975 will fall into this non-skilled classification.

The underprivileged are being left ever farther behind by rising national educational norms. It is estimated that during the 1960's alone, about 7½ million youngsters will have left school without a high school diploma. In a study on *Effects of Family Planning on Poverty in the United States*, Dr. Harold L. Sheppard, an authority in the field of industrial sociology, states:

"One of the results of continued high fertility rates among impoverished families is that a disproportionate number of youths entering the labor force from such families cannot be adequately employed in an economy such as that in the United States of the 1970's and beyond."³

Increased efforts will undoubtedly be made to improve the education and training of the disadvantaged, but this is a herculean task that will require many years to accomplish. If natality among the poor remains as high as it is now, the efforts of educators, business and government to alleviate poverty will continue to be largely cancelled out by unwanted births.

A HALF MILLION UNWANTED BIRTHS A YEAR

The number of unwanted births among the poor and near-poor is much larger than is generally supposed. Even if one were to assume that the poor want as many offspring as the nonpoor—which they do not—then the number of unwanted births among the poor would be the number in excess of what would have been produced at the fertility rate desired by the nonpoor. On this basis, it has been calculated by the Natality Statistics Branch of the U.S. Public Health Service that in 1966, the 8.2 million poor and near poor women of reproductive age had 451,000 unwanted births which might have been avoided. Another estimate places the number of unwanted births at 545,000.

One reason for the lack of public concern about this whole problem is the widespread assumption that the poor have large families because they want them, or perhaps do not care how many children they have. This upper-class notion is utter nonsense. Its falsity has been repeatedly proven by careful research.

An authoritative report prepared by three eminent experts in this field was based on interviews with a representative national sample of married women in 1960. The study showed that lower-income couples wanted somewhat smaller families than higher-income couples. On the average, nonwhite poor couples wanted even fewer children than whites.

Similarly, a study in 1961 by a Princeton research team showed that most blue collar wives want fewer children than white collar wives. A survey by a prominent sociologist among Chicago families substantiated the preference of nonwhites for smaller families than whites. Further corroboration was provided in a 1965 survey by the Florida State Health Department.

An official of the Southern Regional Council who surveyed conditions in Mississippi reports:

returned to school—many moving to the junior college level.

The military has absorbed 1,329.

The cost of training these young men—early dropouts, products of broken homes or slum environments, is now \$5,276, down nearly 50 per cent from the first-year cost into which also included costs of reconditioning a demilitarized army base, establishing a new-type training program, and purchasing equipment.

In addition to the nearly 7,000 employed through the State Employment Service, it is estimated that another 2,000 Corpsmen found work without using the Employment Service, and are presently employed.

In other words, 9,000 or more young men were pulled out of a hopeless, degrading environment, learned how to become productive citizens, and are now earning their own way in self-respect and dignity.

While there may have been some mistakes, it was a new venture for all concerned, a pilot program in which there was much learning to be done by Litton as well as agency people. But there has been progress. The surrounding community, too, has benefited economically: \$4 million annually into the economy for food (\$1,430,000), rent (\$1,190,000), taxes (\$1,000,000), utilities (\$376,000), clothing (\$245,000), transportation (\$179,000), medical (\$120,000), insurance (\$120,000), savings (\$106,000).

The Administration says it will open new training centers within the cities, and that 200 or 300 will be accommodated in place of the 2,000 now being helped.

This statistic is enough to tell the whole sad story.

The program is being mercilessly slashed, will be replaced with a token substitute. And 1,700 boys now being readied for useful roles in society will be tossed back to old haunts, idleness, a dead end.

This story repeats in all the other Centers. It is to be hoped that Congressmen sympathetic to the needs of the underprivileged in urban communities will prevail upon the White House to reconsider and revoke the closure order.

Perhaps it is not too late to change the executive decision. The Times-Star urges all to let their feelings be known to their elected representatives. Perhaps this incipient wrong can yet be righted before it results in throwing gasoline on the coming "long, hot summer."

MRS. OTEPKA RECALLS ORDEAL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, much has been written concerning the long and trying case of Otto F. Otepka, the State Department security officer who gave, without authorization, gave information to a Senate subcommittee to correct false testimony against himself rendered by one of his superiors. Putting "loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department," as the Code of Ethics for Government Service directs, Mr. Otepka never faltered in his battle of over 5 years with the State Department.

As in the case of other men who have successfully overcome monumental obstacles, Otto Otepka's courage was matched by the resolute dedication of his wife Edith. Drawing on that religious

strength which has been the hallmark of this Nation's greatness, Mrs. Otepka, like her husband, refused to yield an inch in the face of a vicious campaign, which must have hit an all-time low in Federal Government relations.

Vera Glaser, writing for the North American Newspaper Alliance, recently reviewed the key part played by Mrs. Otepka in the historic case. This excellent interview should be a source of encouragement to those beset by seemingly insurmountable troubles whose only sustenance at times is the force of moral conviction.

The article, "Mrs. Otepka Recalls Ordeal," from the Washington Star of April 27, 1969, and written by Vera Glaser, insert in the RECORD at this point:

MRS. OTEPKA RECALLS ORDEAL

(By Vera Glaser)

Mrs. Otto F. Otepka is a quiet-spoken school teacher who is married to one of the most controversial figures in public life today.

Her dark hair is turning gray, but her steely resolve has helped her husband weather a five-and-a-half year, headline-studded battle to keep his job as a State Department security officer.

In an exclusive interview, her voice trembling with emotion, Mrs. Otepka compared their ordeal to "something that might have happened in Russia or Nazi Germany. My husband only told the truth, but we were forced to act like criminals."

VINDICATION

When President Nixon recently named Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board, some hailed it as complete vindication. The nomination may run into trouble in the Senate because, among other things of a recent news story linking Otepka to the ultra-right John Birch Society.

Otepka's tough security evaluations of State employees in the early '60s ran afoul of the late Robert Kennedy, then Attorney General, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Otepka was charged with passing confidential documents to a Senate subcommittee.

During that period, Mrs. Otepka recalled, "We were harassed. Men watched our house with binoculars. Otto was locked out of his office. They tapped his phone and we were afraid to use our home phone for fear that was bugged, too. I had to go down to the shopping center when I wanted to talk to Otto."

Sitting in the living room of their neat-as-a-pin home in suburban Silver Spring, Mrs. Otepka stroked her two enormous cats, Inky and Barney, recalling the highlights of a case that has made her husband the symbol of the clash between "liberals" and "conservatives" on how the national security should be protected within the government.

For her, "the Otepka case" began on a summer evening in 1963 when her husband came home and said his superiors had lied to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, then probing State's security practices.

"Otto couldn't have lived with himself if he hadn't given those documents to the committee," she said, describing his action as necessary to verify his own testimony and refute that of his superiors.

She learned how very serious her husband's situation was the following September when she switched on a radio news report to hear, "State Department security officer charged with passing documents to the Senate!"

"You expected them to say, 'to Russia,'" she said, noting that 13 charges were leveled at Otepka at the time. Ten were dropped after his superiors confessed to tapping Otepka's phone, scrutinizing his office trash, and committing perjury before the committee.

"Otto has never been accused of lying or being unfair," his wife said.

The former Edith Simon, Mrs. Otepka was born on a Maryland farm and reared as a Christian Scientist, but now belongs to Grace Episcopal Church. She met Otepka, a Chicagoan of Czech extraction, shortly after she began teaching in the District of Columbia schools. He held a minor government job while studying law at night.

91st Psalm

After their marriage, they lived modestly, stayed out of debt, and planned for the college education of their one daughter Joanne, now 23. In 1957 Mrs. Otepka quit teaching. In 1965, as her husband's troubles with the State Department dragged on, she went back to work and they mortgaged their home.

The couple decided early that keeping busy would help them weather the storm. He bought a boat and took up fishing. She studied art and did church work.

"I kept reading the 91st Psalm," Mrs. Otepka recalled, "especially the part about 'His truth shall be thy shield and buckler.' Last summer I painted the bedrooms and bathroom. It's healthy to be busy. I can't stand self-plenty."

Otepka spent long hours in his basement office organizing material on his case which fills several file cabinets. The walls are hung with mementos and State Department citations for outstanding work, one signed by former Secretary of State Dulles.

Mrs. Otepka maintains her husband's resolve never wavered but friends say they both showed signs of strain. At times the Otepkas seemed to wonder if it was worth-while to give up years of potentially productive activity to pursue the fight. Once Mrs. Otepka wrote her husband a "chin up" note which he has saved.

Occasionally they laughed about their troubles. "We'd say, 'Why watch television?' We've got our own show," Mrs. Otepka reminisced.

In February 1966, three years after he had been charged, Otepka crossed the path of Richard Nixon, who had not yet decided to run for the Presidency. "Stay in there," he told Otepka, "and some day the worm will turn."

"It's true Otto was blocking some Kennedy Administration appointments," Mrs. Otepka said. His job was to follow the security rules laid down by the intelligence agencies. When word came back to us that Bobby had inquired about the possibility of having Otto charged with violation of the espionage act, that did it. We knew then we'd fight it out."

CITIZENSHIP AND THE STUDENT'S ROLE IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly besieged by news stories telling us something is wrong with the youth of today. These stories seldom tell us how many of these young people are growing to be useful citizens.

A young man in the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina suffered a tragic swimming accident 3 years ago at the exciting age of 17.

For many days Sidney White was not expected to live and even now he is completely paralyzed from the waist down. Nevertheless, by his own courage and fortitude he has refused to accept the verdict of his doctors that he would never

April 29, 1969

again be able to sit or stand. Today he does both, though he is mostly confined to a wheelchair.

But Sidney, the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil White of Rockingham, N.C., is not content to mark his growth in physical progress alone. He has been accepted by St. Andrews College of Laurinburg, N.C., with a goal of becoming a high school English teacher.

To prove his capabilities for this vocation, Sidney recently won first in the Civilian Essay Contest for area No. 6—the North Carolina District West. A district victory would place him in competition for international honors.

I am pleased and honored to be able to present his essay for all to read:

CITIZENSHIP AND THE STUDENTS' ROLE IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Sidney O. White)

The youth of today knows clearly what he is opposed to, yet finds difficulty in stating clearly what he favors. It seems that everyone can find something to criticize, something toward which he or she can casually and with little effort direct a discouraging statement. On the other hand, only the sincere and energetic person will take a positive stand. It requires effort to be for something. When one says openly, "I am for this and I will work to see that it happens", he assumes the responsibility of being committed. If such a statement is made in earnest, a hard but often rewarding road lies ahead. The energy with which that person will strive will usually be in direct proportion to the willingness of the person to stand firmly upon his principles. There is a trend in the United States toward standing against everything and for nothing. People are failing to project the proper image.

Wherever you go, whatever you say, you project an image to whomever you meet. Few people are aware of this projection; if they were, they would probably be more conscious of their behavior, for their impression represents what type of citizens they are. No matter how a person conducts himself, and no matter how mischievous he is, that person wants to be recognized. His behavior in itself is evidence of this need. By misbehaving this person is drawing attention to himself. He is doing this in an effort to impress his peers. People are striving for citizenship. The means which they employ are usually a reflection of their standards. Before one can know a proper means toward recognition, he must first set a goal and contrive a method to achieve it.

The first step toward setting a goal is knowing what citizenship is. Citizenship is simply conduct. It is the attitude with which you approach and overcome a problem. It would seem that citizenship boils down to a matter of attitude, so the initial step toward becoming a good citizen is to assume the correct frame of mind. Be a positive thinker, and remember to project a good image. Do this and you cannot go too far astray.

The youth of today must realize his responsibility in becoming a mature, productive citizen. He must become aware of the image which he is projecting. Once this awakening takes place there will be no limit to the potential of our citizens. Within youth lies the energy which is needed to thrust this nation onward. How this energy is directed will determine how our history will be written. Will we progress, or will we regress? We must all labor to be good citizens in order to insure progress, and we must place our youth clearly in the forefront of the struggle. The future is the estate inherited by youth; and as Americans, our heritage is proud. Let us see that it remains proud for posterity!

As a student, your role in the United States should be clear. You are tomorrow's America. Take your positive stand and work for a better United States, never forgetting the past, and always looking ahead. Profit by your nation's mistakes, rather than dwelling upon them. Be a citizen of America—not just a member of its government! Love her as a mother, for she has given you freedom—a gift often valued above life itself.

THERE IS RESPONSIBILITY IN MOTION PICTURE DISTRIBUTING

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, these days we hear much of what is evil in our national life, including how the arts are being utilized to corrupt. Such is not always the case, as the following illustration will show.

Mr. Sheldon Tromberg, president of Boxoffice Attractions, Inc., of this Capital City, has set a different tone by the pictures he chooses to handle, the manner in which he presents them, and the example he sets within his own industry. It is one of his major aims to see to it that first-class entertainment is made available to young people. By the life he leads in business and otherwise, he has brought great credit to his family and industry.

A graduate of Columbia University, he is president of his own enterprise in Washington, and acts as a motion picture reviewer for the Washingtonian magazine. He has spoken before a good many other groups involved in the motion picture industry on the subject of the speech which I am including here for reprinting in the RECORD. This address is a first-rate exposition of the situation our film business and theaters face now, and an outline of what they must do to remain relevant in the future.

The speech was given on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the National Association of the Theater Owners of America in Detroit, Mich. A final note is in order here. Mr. Tromberg is the son of the family which has operated Tromberg's Department Store in Bensonhurst, at West 10th Street and Avenue O, Brooklyn, N.Y., for the past 40 years. He is a credit to these people, who have been an institution in their neighborhood for all these years.

The speech follows:

MOVIES: THE THIRD ACT OF THE 20TH CENTURY

(By Sheldon Trombert)

Who will write the 3rd act of the motion picture industry in the 20th century?

We see a new generation of Americans attuned to the visual arts: They have seen the light! Have we seen the light?

They are a new breed Artstotoleans.

They tell us that images, of whatever sort, have a cathartic effect.

They tell us that what they see visually allows the human mind to release impulses and aggressions.

The 1st act of the 20th century began with a movie show at Koster and Bials and, then to the opening of the first movie theater in Los Angeles.

Immigrant Americans learned the English language through subtleties on films.

Movies were the mass entertainment. They harnessed the dreams and hopes of the working classes.

People were concerned with structure, plot, content and spectacle. They were Platoists. The first act ended with a revolt.

The flaming youth of the 1920's and 1930's revolted against the deadly, dull lives of their parents. They demonstrated for greater freedom of speech and personal relations.

Motion pictures reflected their preoccupation with petting parties, new dances and fast cars.

Film going became a necessity as an outlet for the entertainment and awakening learning processes.

The 2nd act of the 20th century began on the street corner apple carts of our major cities. Depression-bound and depression-minded, America's film audiences were "treated" to gala screen achievements—color—sound—and stars!

All these ingredients were guaranteed to mask and relieve their depression. It was soporific cinema, sluiced and spliced for mass consumption, and bought with gusto.

The 2nd act ended with the influence of European film-makers—just as the 1st act began with the influence of European immigrant audiences.

America's experiences during the 2nd World War brought on a new wave of realism.

The film, "The Best Years of Our Lives" brought down the curtain on the 2nd act, the act that began with "The Jazz Singer."

And now, we have, generically speaking, films everywhere! Television, homes, hotels, ships at sea, planes in the sky, trains on the rails, submarines beneath the oceans, spaceships in the outer world, hospitals, country clubs, schools, prisons and theatres.

And, it's still the cinema that remains the mother religion—it is still cinemas that set the patterns and create customers for film everywhere.

Movies have become the outlets for rebellion. Once again, the battle is aimed against the traditionally structured society.

America's moviegoers are "tuning out" the story and "tuning in" on their environment. They are "groovy". They are visceral. They don't hear the dialogue—their receptors are tuned to the changing scenes, the shapes and motions, the sounds and lights that are flashed on the screen.

They are concerned with the totality of images. They want to experience and feel what they are seeing, rather than intellectualize.

They are boxoffice existentialists.

As Karl Baedeker put it, "There is a need for a balance between the world inside us and the world outside us. It is a reciprocal process: Both worlds form a single one".

Motion picture courses are the hottest elective subjects on our college campuses—with a present enrollment of about 60,000 and with the thousands growing monthly, the young are polemicalizing; they practice the art of controversy.

They believe that man makes his own way in the World and leads his own life thru conflicts, seeking identity thru blunders.

This new generation of indigenous Americans have their own films rising from an underground. There are films fractionalized to satisfy every sub-culture in American society.

Who will be the film leaders in the 3rd act? How will they react to the 3rd act?

Will they give us giant cartoon-sized films, filled with stupefying trivia, marked for the fast buck?

Will they give us narcotic fantasies rendering our lives relatively simple?

Will they pursue the idea that great art evokes great emotions?

Will they bureaucratize, pasturize, homogenize and alphabatize movies as if brand-